

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 004

EC 100 553

AUTHOR Silverman-Dresner, Toby
TITLE Resource Room for the Speech Handicapped. (School Year 1974-1975).
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 15p.; Best copy available
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Exceptional Child Research; Junior High Schools; Language Skills; *Program Effectiveness; *Resource Centers; Sensory Aids; *Speech Handicapped; Speech Skills; *Speech Therapy

ABSTRACT

Thirty-two junior high school students with severe communication defects were provided with speech therapy--which included videotape feedback techniques, phonic mirror, tape recorder, "s" meter, pitch meter, language master, bicom, and other sensory aids--in the Speech and Language Resource Room (Queens, New York). Evaluation procedures included administration of the Templin-Darley Articulation Test, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, and evaluator observations. Findings indicated that students serviced by the Speech Resource Room program made significant improvement in their speech and language skills. (SBH)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED138004

EVALUATION REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

Function No. 09-56610

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RESOURCE ROOM FOR THE SPEECH HANDICAPPED
(SCHOOL YEAR 1974-1975)

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to:

EC

TM

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

DR. TOBY SILVERMAN-DRESNER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title VI-B Education of the Handicapped Act and performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-1975 school year.

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201



EC100553

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHAPTER I THE PROGRAM.....	1
CHAPTER II EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES.....	3
CHAPTER III FINDINGS.....	5
CHAPTER IV SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
DATA LOSS FORM.....	10
NIR.....	9

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: TEST SUMMARY DATA.....	5
---------------------------------	---

CHAPTER I THE PROGRAM

Thirty two Junior High School students, ages 12-16, with severe communication defects were provided with speech therapy in the Speech and Language Resource Room of Junior High School 158 in Queens. The students, selected through screening and referrals represented a wide array of disorders: stuttering, language defects such as problems in auditory comprehension, auditory sequencing, verbal expression and reading, as well as articulatory problems associated with hearing loss, cleft palate, cerebral palsy, brain injury etc.

The program began in September of 1974 and ran through June of 1975. Each student received speech therapy in twenty minutes sessions, from the highly trained and skilled full time speech teacher, between 3 and 5 times each week. Most of the therapy sessions were on an individual basis, but occasionally pairs of students were seen together. The speech teacher, a specialist in innovative therapy techniques worked with each child on his particular problem using video tape feedback techniques, phonic mirror, tape recorder, "s" meter, pitch meter, language master, bicom and other sensory aids.

The teacher held periodic conferences with each student's regular teacher and kept the families of the students informed via group and individual meetings. She also met periodically with, and was observed by other speech teachers, instructing them in the use of the equipment and demonstrated therapy techniques to them. Among the techniques employed was the use of the Monterey Language Program (1971), a behavior modification approach to syntax learning, which was used with the

students and demonstrated to other teachers. A constant feedback and flow of information was generated by the administration and supervision provided by the Bureau for Speech Improvement.

As a result of their extensive therapy program, the students were expected to show improved communication ability as measured by the Tomlin-Darley Articulation Test and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

CHAPTER II EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

Evaluation Objective #1: As a result of participation in the Resource Room Program, the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score on the Templin Darley Articulation Test.

Each of the thirty two students was individually administered the Templin-Darley Articulation Test in September of 1974, thirty of these students were re-tested in June of 1975. (1 student was suspended, 1 student sustained a long illness) Pre- and post-test Means were compared via a "t" test for the significance of a difference between correlated pairs of Means. The Templin-Darley gives error scores; the lower the score, the better the performance.

Evaluation Objective #2: As a result of participation in the Resource Room Program, the language grade of the students enrolled will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

Each of the thirty two students was individually administered the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test in September of 1974, and thirty of them were re-tested in June of 1975 (see data loss form p.10). Pre- and post-test Means were compared via a "t" test for the significance of a difference between correlated pairs of Means.

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The evaluator observed the program periodically throughout the school year. The teacher's calendar was reviewed to determine the number of family conferences and parents meetings and other speech

teachers were interviewed about their participation in the
Resource Room Program.

CHAPTER III FINDINGS

Evaluation Objective #1: As a result of participation in the Resource Room Program, the students will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score on the Templin-Darley Articulation Test.

On the pre-test, the Mean error score was 29.59, on the post-test, the Mean was 17.13. Since the Templin-Darley gives error scores, the lower the score, the better the performance. The "t" test for the difference between the Means (5.73) was significant at the .001 level, indicating significant improvement from pre- to post-testing. Evaluation Objective #1 was achieved. (See Table 1 below)

Evaluation Objective #2: As a result of participation in the Resource Room Program, the language grade of the students enrolled will show a statistically significant difference between the pre-test score and the post-test score on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test.

The Mean score on the pre-test was 84.5, the post-test Mean score was 88.1, the resulting "t" (2.11) was significant at the .05 level. Evaluation Objective #2, improved performance on the Peabody was achieved. (See Table 1 below)

Table 1. Test Summary Data

Table 1. Test Summary Data					
	(N=30)				
Test	Pretest		Post-Test		
	Mean	Standard Dev.	Mean	Standard Dev.	
Templin-Darley Artic.	29.59	23.45	17.13	18.30	5.73***
Peabody Picture Vocabulary	84.50	18.02	88.10	18.27	2.11*

*** significant at the .001 level

* significant at the .05 level

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

All aspects of the program: therapy sessions, conferences with the parents, demonstration of techniques for other speech teachers, consultation with regular teachers, were carried out as described in the proposal.

In the previous evaluation report, (1973-74), a number of recommendations were offered, some of which are applicable to an aspect of the program which does not appear in the present proposal. What was relevant was the recommendation that the program be expanded.

This has not yet been implemented.

The program is a highly successful one, which does demonstrate that it is possible to improve the speech and language skills of children with severe communication disorders to a significant degree. It is providing a valuable service to these children. The level of instruction is superior, the facilities and materials are appropriate to the needs of this population. The administration and supervision of the program is excellent. The entire program should be expanded and used as a demonstration model for similar Resource Room programs.

CHAPTER IV SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The students serviced by the Speech Resource Room program made significant improvement in their speech and language skills as demonstrated by their significantly improved scores on the Templin-Darley Articulation and Peabody Picture Vocabulary Tests.

The program is a highly successful one which should be continued and expanded.

In the same manner as the current Resource Room is an expansion of the elementary school Resource Room Program; the Junior High School program should now be expanded into a Senior High School Resource Room Program. The students currently serviced, many of whom are organically impaired, still need more therapy to improve their communication skills, but there is currently no High School Resource Room to serve them. The priority recommendation then, is to establish a continuation of the present Resource Room structure in the High School. It is further recommended that each borough have a Resource Room Program, similar to the highly successful one now in existence, to which students with severe communication disorders may be transferred.

New equipment should be purchased for the existing and future Resource Room programs, including voice lites, nasality indicators and other modern sensory aids, as they have great practical utility. The equipment is especially appropriate for use with adolescents where student motivation is a major stumbling block. The use of this equipment generates not only sustained motivation in the students but also generates self-corrective behavior, which is the critical outcome of therapy.

The current program's success could be greatly extended by the addition of a family or education assistant. The prime task of this para-professional would be to work under the supervision of the teacher and project coordinator to extend and support the existing family counselling aspect of the program. This person would ideally service the larger community as well, by emphasizing preventive education.

To allow the present successful operation to function more smoothly, three recommendations are offered: 1) A telephone is required in the Resource Room to communicate with parents and schedule appointments for students requiring special services such as ear, nose and throat evaluations. 2) Duplicating equipment such as a rexograph and electric typewriter should be housed in the Resource Room for instant processing of materials, rather than the present system of using the school's office services on an as available basis. 3) More free periods are required for equipment maintenance, with a special need for some free time at the beginning and end of the school day to set up and put away equipment. 4) Purchase of a voice lite as an aid in vocal intensity training.

Use Table 30C. for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to tables 30A. and 30B.

30C. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

51

Component Code					Activity Code			Test Used ^{1/}	Form		Level		Total N ^{2/}	Group ID ^{3/}	Number Tested		Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data		
									Pre	Post	Pre	Post			N ^{4/}	Score Type ^{5/}	Date	Mean	SD ^{6/}	Date	Mean	SD ^{6/}	Test ^{7/}	Value ^{8/}	Level ^{9/}
6	9	9	1	5	7	2	4	TDAT	only	1	only	1	32	15	30	6	9/74	29.6	23.45	6/75	17.1	18.30	t	5.73	.001
6	9	9	1	5	7	2	4	PPVT	A	A	only	1	32	15	30	6	9/74	84.5	18.02	6/75	88.1	18.27	t	2.11	.05

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # 10-5-10

In this table enter all data loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code				Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed		Number/ Reason
									N	%			
6	9	9	1	5	7	2	4	1	32	30	2	5	One student was not tested, one student was not analyzed.

- (1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
- (2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
- (3) Number of participants in the activity.
- (4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
- (5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
- (6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.